

appropriations bills tomorrow and Friday. So, I just state to my colleagues, as far as we can determine at this point, there will be votes throughout the day on Friday and there will be votes on Monday. We will try to accommodate people on Monday by having votes occur later in the afternoon, but there will be votes on Monday.

So, again, I hope we can move ahead on reg reform. It seems to me, rather than to just stand in recess, we might as well move on to the Bosnia resolution, which is highly important, as noted by the Chaplain this morning. There are no easy answers when it comes to this conflict. But it seems to me the best option at this point is to lift the arms embargo, give the Bosnians a right to defend themselves. They are an independent nation. They are a member of the United Nations. And under article 51, they have the right, or should have the right, of self-defense. This is not involving American ground troops. In my view, it certainly does not Americanize the war. If anything, it moves us farther away from the conflict. I believe that would be in our interest and would satisfy the concerns of most Americans.

I reserve the remainder of my leader time.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Under the previous order, there will now be the period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 9:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

Mr. DOLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1995 second quarter mass mailings is July 25, 1995. If a Senator's office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records Office will be open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, earlier this month, in homes, neighborhoods,

and communities across the country, Americans celebrated our Nation's 219th birthday.

There was, of course, much to celebrate. Over two centuries after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, America remains what she has always been—the beacon of freedom, and the last best hope for all mankind on Earth.

REMEMBERING AMERICAN HISTORY

But as we celebrate these freedoms, and commemorate those who have sacrificed so much along the way, we must also remember that American history is not always a tale of progress and dreams fulfilled.

American history is a history of hope mixed with tragedy—institutionalized slavery, a Constitution which said that African-Americans were only three-fifths human, Jim Crow and "separate but equal."

This legacy is a source of great shame for us precisely because so many of these outrages contradicted one of the founding principles of our republic—that all men are created equal and that we are all endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights, including the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Today, in the America of 1995, the evils of discrimination and racism persist. They may not be as blatant as they once were. They may not be as fashionable. But they are out there, lurking in the corners, poisoning young minds, and yes, harming real people in the process.

Over the years, Americans of goodwill have tried to make a difference. We have enacted an array of anti-discrimination laws. And in the 1960's and the early 1970's, the concept of affirmative action was born, the product of a heartfelt desire to rectify past injustices and expand opportunity for all Americans. Many Republicans, acting with the best of intentions, were directly involved in this effort. I, for one, not only supported the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, but have also endorsed certain race- and gender-conscious steps to remedy the lingering effects of historic discrimination. That is my record, and I am proud of it.

ONLY A TEMPORARY REMEDY

Few of us, however, believed that these policies would become a seemingly permanent fixture of our society, but that is exactly what they have become today.

During the past 30 years, we have seen the policies of preference grow and grow and grow some more, pitting American against American, group against group, in a bitter competition for a piece of the Government pie.

Somehow, somewhere along the way, fighting discrimination has become an easy excuse to abandon the color-blind ideal. Too often today, the laudable goal of expanding opportunity is used by the Federal Government to justify dividing Americans. That is wrong, and it ought to stop. You do not cure the

evil of discrimination with more discrimination.

THE PRESIDENT'S REVIEW: LACK OF LEADERSHIP

President Clinton had the opportunity today to stand up for principle by stating—in the clearest possible terms—that it is wrong for the Federal Government to discriminate against its citizens on the basis of race, color, ethnic background, or gender.

Without hesitation or ambiguity, he could have said "yes" to individual rights, and "no" to group rights; "yes" to the principle of equal opportunity and "no" to the perversion of this principle with the divisive policies of preference.

Instead of clarity—and I have just finished listening to the President—the President has chosen confusion. He has chosen to complicate an uncomplicated issue with an avalanche of words and fine distinctions.

This is not a difficult issue: discrimination is wrong, and preferential treatment is wrong, too. Our Government in Washington should unite the American people, not divide us. It should guarantee equal opportunity, not divide Americans through the use of quotas, set-asides, numerical objectives, and other preferences.

And that is why I will introduce legislation next week designed to get the Federal Government out of the group preference business. The President says he is against quotas. Quotas are only a small part of the entire regime of preferences. It is not enough to oppose "quotas," as if the label is what might be offensive. It is the practice of dividing Americans through any form of preferential treatment that is objectionable.

The President also denounces preferences for "unqualified"—"unqualified" individuals, when the real issue here is not preferences for the unqualified, which virtually every American opposes—why have preferences for the unqualified?—but preferences for the "less qualified" over those who are "more qualified." That is the debate. This distinction is critical. But it is one that the President conveniently ignores.

Madam President, leadership is about making the tough choices. It is about staking out a clear and crisp principle and holding firm to it. And, yes, leadership can sometimes mean putting a little distance between yourself and your political allies. Regrettably, the President is trying to have it both ways.

A CIVIL RIGHTS AGENDA FOR THE 1990'S

Madam President, 2 years ago, I convened a meeting in my office with a distinguished group of African-American leaders with the goal of developing a civil rights agenda for the 1990's, one that is relevant for the needs and challenges of our time. A relevant civil rights agenda means enforcing the antidiscrimination laws that are already on the books—enforcing the antidiscrimination laws that are already

on the books. It means removing regulatory barriers to economic opportunity—something we are in the throes of trying to do right now on the Senate floor—including the discriminatory Davis-Bacon Act. It means school choice for low-income, inner-city people and means meaningful welfare reform that will transform lives from ones of dependence to ones of independence. And it means making our streets safer and renewing the war on drugs. After all, our first civil right is freedom from the fear of crime.

This is the real civil rights agenda of our time. Not preferences, not set-asides, not quotas, but the dreams that are built on real opportunity.

Madam President, I would hope when I introduce my bill it will become at least a focus of dialog because I know different people have different views. But none of us believes that discrimination is appropriate. It is wrong. It has always been wrong. It should be punished. And I think that is what this debate is all about.

DANGEROUS TRENDS IN DOWNSIZING MILITARY HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I would like to bring to your attention a matter of serious concern to me regarding the future of our currently superb military forces—and the inextricable link between a quality volunteer force and an equally robust, quality, military health care system.

I have followed closely the downsizing of our military forces over the past several years. The Active Force will have come down from 2.1 million service members in 1990 to 1.45 million by 1997, a 32-percent reduction from cold war levels. The Navy will see its fleet reduced from 546 battle force ships to 346 in the same time period with only 12 aircraft carriers in commission by the end of the century. The Army will go from 18 to 10 active divisions and the Air Force from 24 to 13 active fighter wing equivalents. The Marine Corps will likewise be reduced from a force of 200,000 men and women in uniform to a force of 174,000.

We have repeatedly promised that there will be no more Task Force Smiths—a tragic result of that period of time just prior to the Korean conflict in the early 1950's when we truly had a hollow force. Yet, I see us slowly but surely moving toward this state of readiness—or should I say, unreadiness. Although it causes me great sadness to even contemplate the repeat of such a tragedy, I must tell you that in the not-too-distant future, I envision us once again being called upon to answer to our brave service members and the American people, "Why did we let another Task Force Smith occur?"

I have been here long enough to know what is meant by a hollow military. In the 1970's, 25 percent of new recruits were category IV—the lowest recruitable mental group—and, as a re-

sult, 30 percent of our ships—brandnew ships with brandnew equipment—were not fit for combat due to a lack of sailors to man them. For although our military possesses superior technology and superior weapons systems, it is the people who really determine the readiness of our forces. And these people, the men and women in uniform, are recruited from and reflect a cross-section of the American population. Although the services met their recruiting goals last year—and keep in mind that these goals are much lower than they were a few years ago—the military has had to dramatically increase their recruiting budget as well as the number of their recruiters to do so. Even so, it now takes 1.6 times the number of recruiter contacts to achieve one recruit. The reality of our national culture today is that the propensity for young people to join our military is at a 10-year low, down 39 percent among 16- to 21-year old males just since 1991, according to the Army.

While it concerns me to watch the reduction of our forces, I understand and support the need to balance the size of our military services with the threats facing us today and in the near future. However, we must not lose sight of the reality that major armed conflicts are still a very real possibility and could come at any time in the form of aggression by regional powers such as Iraq and North Korea. In his recent testimony before the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Vice Admiral Macke, the commander in chief of the United States Pacific Command, called North Korea the nation with the highest threat potential today. Dr. Henry Kissinger, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in February, warned that "more and more states are coming into being that feel no responsibility to any global international system or international stability." He also cited the North Korean situation, the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, and the growth of Islamic fundamentalists as serious threats to our national security that could involve us once again in armed conflict.

More recently and more frequently, however, we have seen a preponderance of internal regional and national conflicts that require our armed services to respond with operations short of war. These operations not only strain our defense capabilities but drain current year defense budgets. When taken into consideration with other security threats, I become gravely concerned about the speed and direction of our force reductions.

Of particular concern to me is the downsizing of the services' medical structure—both peacetime and wartime personnel and units. While I do not wish to tie the hands of the Department or the service chiefs as they restructure their forces, I am increasingly concerned over the severity of reductions to the services' medical de-

partments. In my opinion, the military health service system is being taken down too far, too fast.

The military leaders and decision-makers have a tendency to see military health care as less important than the men and women who fly airplanes or who drive tanks. However, I caution you that our military is essentially a team, and if one member of the team is weak, the entire team is weak. Although the medical departments might seem less crucial to the preparation for or the outcome of war, I assure you that to the men and women in combat, they are absolutely essential members of the team. To be effective fighting forces, the servicemembers must be able to concentrate on combat and keep their minds completely clear—free from worry about their own well-being and, even more importantly, free from worry about the health and well-being of their spouses and children at home. Without the knowledge and security that their families are well cared for, our military personnel will lose much of their effectiveness that they have so ably demonstrated during the past decade.

First, I will address combat medicine—caring for the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who risk injury and death around the world. When I was injured in World War II, it took 9 hours for me to get to medical care—9 hours. But in 1945 that was not too bad—Americans probably did not expect any faster battlefield evacuation and care. Today, when a soldier or marine is wounded in combat, he or she can be at the hospital within 15 minutes. In fact, we learned in Korea and Vietnam that if we could get wounded soldiers to hospitals within 15 to 30 minutes—and we did that pretty regularly—we could save most of those who survived their initial wounding.

Because of our experiences in these wars, Americans now have come to expect emergency medical services [EMS] systems, 911 phone lines, paramedics with highly technical skills, and advanced EMS and air flight ambulances with sophisticated emergency medical equipment. Most of these capabilities also exist in our military combat health support systems and soon they will have more advanced combat medical technologies such as telemedicine, filmless x rays, and other new medical innovations that will further improve battlefield survival rates. Americans have come to expect this level of care and our service members and their families deserve it.

Trauma experts talk of the golden hour—the first hour after initial injury—when the greatest percentage of patient lives can be saved. Let me give you one example. In March 1994, there was a horrible training accident involving soldiers of the 82d Airborne Division on the green ramp—the area where the paratroopers wait to take off—at Pope Air Force Base, adjacent to Fort Bragg, NC. Many soldiers were saved by the expert buddy aid training that